



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,546	12/02/2005	Brian Douglas Smith	P-356.36 (PCT) (US)	2962
30544 7590 01/28/2009 JACKSON WALKER, L.L.P. 112 E. PECAN, SUITE 2400 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78205				
EXAMINER				
MONIKANG, GEORGE C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/28/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/559,546

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

GEORGE C. MONIKANG

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35-39 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-39 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/559,546.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/88)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 10/1/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 35-39 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of official notice taken.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. Claims 35 & 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allaei's admitted prior art (hereinafter referred to as AAPA, col. 1, lines 11-30), US Patent 6,957,516 B2, in view of Shoureshi, US Patent 5,629,986.

Re Claim 35, AAPA discloses a noise control device for a glass window in a building (AAPA, col. 1, lines 11-13), including processing means for detecting in a received signal a predetermined characteristic of noise external to said building (AAPA, col. 1, lines 19-27), for generating a cancellation signal and for supplying said cancellation signal to an audio frequency actuator directly attached to the glass of the window and adapted to couple said signal into the glass in the plane of said face pain surface to cause the glass to radiate the acoustic antiphase signal into the building to reduce the perceived intensity of the external noise in the building (AAPA, col. 1, lines 19-27: the vibration dampening material absorbs the noise from outside and radiates antinoise signals into the interior); but fails to disclose an encoder interface adapted to receive signals from an audio sensor. However, Shoureshi does (Shoureshi, col. 4, lines 23-30).

Taking the combined teachings of AAPA and Shoureshi as a whole, one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to combine the noise control device for a building glass window of AAPA with an encoder interface adapted to receive signals from said audio frequency sensor as taught in Shoureshi (Shoureshi, col. 4, lines 23-30) for the purpose of controlling noise and vibration.

The combined teachings of AAPA and Shoureshi also fail to disclose an audio frequency sensor attached to the window as claimed. Official notice is taken that both the concepts and advantages of providing an audio frequency attached to the window are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to use a frequency sensor attached to the window within the noise control device of AAPA and Shoureshi for the

purpose of being able to cancel noise within a particular frequency so as not to always operate the system when it is not deemed necessary and thus creating a more efficient system.

Re Claim 38, the combined teachings of AAPA and Shoureshi disclose a noise control device according to claim 35, wherein the predetermined characteristic is indicative of the noise of an airplane flying over said building (AAPA, col. 1, lines 11-18: system is designed to reduce any noise outside the window).

Re Claim 39, the combined teachings of AAPA and Shoureshi disclose a noise control device according to claim 35, wherein the predetermined characteristic is indicative of traffic noise (AAPA, col. 1, lines 11-18: system is designed to reduce any noise outside the window).

2. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allaei's admitted prior art (hereinafter referred to as AAPA, col. 1, lines 11-30), US Patent 6,957,516 B2 and Shoureshi, US Patent 5,629,986, as applied to claim 35 above, in view of Pelrine et al, US Patent 6,343,129 B1.

Re Claim 36, the combined teachings of AAPA and Shoureshi disclose a noise control device according to Claim 35, but fail to disclose wherein the microphone and the acoustic actuator are combined into a single device as taught in Pelrine et al (Pelrine et al, col. 4, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious to use the microphone acoustic detector of Pelrine et al (Pelrine et al, col. 4, lines 59-63) with the noise control

device of AAPA and Shoureshi for the purpose of picking up external noise to be cancelled.

3. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allaei's admitted prior art (hereinafter referred to as AAPA, col. 1, lines 11-30), US Patent 6,957,516 B2, Shoureshi, US Patent 5,629,986, and Pelrine et al, US Patent 6,343,129 B1, as applied to claim 36 above, in view of Wan, US Patent 5,978,489.

Re Claim 37, the combined teachings of AAPA, Shoureshi and Pelrine et al disclose the noise control device according to claim 36, but fail to disclose wherein said single device is a magnetostrictive actuator as taught in Wan (Wan, col. 2, lines 41-45). It would have been obvious to use the magnetostrictive actuator of Wan (Wan, col. 2, lines 41-45) with the noise control device of AAPA, Shoureshi and Pelrine et al for the purpose of changing the actuators shape when they are subjected to a magnetic field.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GEORGE C. MONIKANG whose telephone number is (571)270-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. alt Fri. Off 7:30am-5:00pm (est).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chin Vivian can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George C Monikang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2614

12/13/2008

/Vivian Chin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614